IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 8132 of 2004

Between:

P. Manohar, S/o. Late P. Devender,
Caste: Medari, Hindu, R/o. 3-4-663/23,
Near Divya Jyothi School, Shivajinagar, Narayanguda, Hyderabad. A.P.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Managing Director, A.P. Housing Corporation,
Himayathnagar, Hyderabad, A.P.
2 The Vice Chairman, A.P. Housing Board at Gruhakalpa, Hyderabad, A.P.
3 The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road,
Hyderabad, A.P.,
4 The Revenue Divisional Officer (R.D.O) at Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad, A.P.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to call for the records of the case, and after perusing the same, order R1 to R4 to allot house under weaker Section by issuing a Writ of Mandamus order or direction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, and order rehabilitation of the petitioner: i) Costs be awarded; ii) Any other appropriate order or orders or reliefs.

Counsel for the Petitioner : MR. T.MOHAN RAO

Counsel for the Respondents 1 & 2: Mr. J.Prabhakar (N.P.)

Counsel for the respondents 3 & 4 : G.P. for Revenue (N.P.)

The Court made the following :

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO.8132 OF 2004

ORAL ORDER :

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner.

Despite notice, none appeared for the respondents and no counter-affidavit is filed on their behalf.

As can be seen from the material on record, the only grievance of the petitioner appears to be that the respondents having proposed to provide permanent house to the petitioner along with other similarly situated persons, failed to include the name of the petitioner in the list of the persons recommended for permanent houses without there being any justifiable reason. It is stated that in the circumstances, the petitioner made a representation dated 19-01-2002 requesting the first respondent – A.P. Housing Corporation to allot a house to him on par with similarly situated persons. Alleging that the respondents failed to consider the said representation, this writ petition is filed.

Having heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and particularly keeping in view the representation made by the petitioner is still pending before the first respondent, without expressing any opinion on merits, the Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the first respondent to consider the representation made by the petitioner dated 19-01-2002 and to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

18-01-2005

gbs

To

1 The Managing Director, A.P. Housing Corporation,
Himayathnagar, Hyderabad, A.P.
2 The Vice Chairman, A.P. Housing Board at Gruhakalpa, Hyderabad, A.P.
3 The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road,
Hyderabad, A.P.,
4 The Revenue Divisional Officer (R.D.O) at Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad, A.P.

5. 2CD copies

6. 2 CCs to G.P. for Revenue, High Court of AP Blds, Hyderabad (OUT).